

**REMARKS**

**Summary of Office Action**

Claims 98-189 are pending in this application.

The Examiner rejected Claims 152, 155, and 157-160 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for lacking antecedent basis for “said voice message.”

The Examiner rejected Claims 98, 99, 112-125, 131, 133-138, 141-144, 146-150, 153, 163-175, 177, 179-181, 183-185, and 188-189 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of Ensor *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 5,623,537.

The Examiner objected to Claims 100-111, 126-130, 132, 139, 140, 145, 151, 154, 156, 176, 178, 182, 186, and 187 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**35 U.S.C § 112 Rejection**

Applicants have proposed amending Claims 152, 155, and 157-160 to change their dependencies from Claim 150 to Claim 151. Claim 151 refers to “a voice message,” which provides antecedent basis for “said voice message.”

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of Claims 152, 155, and 157-160.

**Amendments Placing Claims in Independent Form**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for noting the allowability of the subject matter defined by Claims 100-111, 126-130, 132, 139, 140, 145, 151, 154, 156, 176, 178, 182, 186, and 187 (Office Action, p. 9). In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, applicants have proposed rewriting the following claims in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims:

Claim 100 has been amended to include the features of Claims 98 and 99.

Claim 126 has been amended to include the features of Claims 98, 99, 112, 118, and 125.

Claim 127 has been amended to include the features of Claims 98, 99, 112, 118, and 125.

Claim 128 has been amended to include the features of Claims 98, 99, and 112.

Claim 132 has been amended to include the features of Claims 98, 99, and 131.

Claim 145 has been amended to include the features of Claims 98, 99, and 131.

Claim 151 has been amended to include the features of Claim 149.

Claim 176 has been amended to include the features of Claims 149, 150, 163, 169, and 175.

Claim 178 has been amended to include the features of Claims 149, 150, 163, 169, and 170.

Claim 182 has been amended to include the features of Claims 149 and 181.

Accordingly, rewritten independent Claims 100, 126-128, 132, 145, 151, 176, 178, and 182 are in condition for allowance. Claims 101-111, 129, 130, 139, 140, 152-155, 157-162, 179, 180, 186, and 187, which depend either directly or indirectly from these independent

claims, are also allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claims are allowable.

Entry of the amendments and allowance of these claims are accordingly respectfully requested.

**Additional Amendments of the Claims**

Applicants have proposed amending Claims 153 and 156 to change their dependencies from Claim 150 to Claim 151. Amended Claims 153 and 156 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that independent Claim 151 is allowable.

Applicants have proposed placing Claim 177 in independent form to include the features of Claims 149, 150, 163, 169, and 175. As amended, apparatus Claim 177 includes features similar to the features of corresponding method Claim 127 (as amended), which was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable (Office Action, p. 9). Therefore, amended Claim 177 is allowable for at least the reasons that amended Claim 127 is allowable.\* Claims 179 and 180 depend from Claim 177 and, therefore, are allowable for at least the reasons that amended Claim 177 is allowable.

Applicants have proposed canceling Claims 98, 99, 112-125, 131, 133-138, 141-144, 146-150, 163-175, 181, 183-185, 188, and 189 without prejudice. The 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of these claims would therefore be moot.

---

\* The Office Action purports to reject apparatus Claim 177 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for the same reason that corresponding method Claim 127 is rejected (Office Action, p. 8). However, the Office Action does not reject Claim 127 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and instead concludes that Claim 127 defines allowable subject matter (Office Action, p. 9). Accordingly, applicants believe that the Examiner did not intend to reject Claim 177 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and, therefore, such a rejection of Claim 177 will not be further addressed herein by applicants. If for

**Conclusion**

The foregoing demonstrates that the proposed amendments place Claims 100-111, 126-130, 132, 139, 140, 145, 151-162, 176-180, 182, 186, and 187 in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendments and allowance of these claims are accordingly respectfully requested. The proposed amendments should be entered because the amendments merely cancel claims, adopt Examiner suggestions, and require only a cursory review by the Examiner (MPEP § 714.13). Should the Examiner deem that further clarification of the record is in order, we invite a telephone call to applicants' undersigned agent to expedite further processing of the application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 28, 2005

  
Peter F. Snell  
Agent for Applicants  
Reg. No. 52,235  
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS  
GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.  
Chrysler Center  
666 Third Avenue, 24<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10017  
Tel: (212) 935-3000  
Fax: (212) 983-3115

---

some reason applicants' belief is incorrect, applicants respectfully request clarification from the Examiner in a new Office Action that restarts the statutory period for response.